UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,326	12/29/2000	Pankaj Kedia	42390P10227	1211

7590 08/31/2007

Stephen T. Neal
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
CHEN, TSE W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09753326	12/29/00	KEDIA ET AL.	42390P10227

Stephen T. Neal
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
Tse Chen	
ART UNIT	**PAPER**
2116	20070823

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In view of Applicant's appeal brief filed on May 29, 2007, the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is withdrawn.
A new office action is hereby attached.

Tse Chen
August 23, 2007

REHANA PERVEEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
8/29/07

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/753,326	KEDIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tse Chen	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *29-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *29-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the appeal brief filed on May 29, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31. A new notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee will not be required for applicant to appeal from the new Office action. Any appeal brief filed on or after September 13, 2004 must comply with 37 CFR 41.37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umina et al., US Patent 5287485, hereinafter Umina, in view of Barber et al., US Patent 6240521, hereinafter Barber.

3. In re claim 29, Umina discloses a method comprising [fig.2; col.4, ll. 14-20]:

- A computer system having a CPU [202] and a memory [204].

- A [low power] subsystem including a [low power] processor [206] and a [low power] memory [208].

4. Umina did not disclose low power operations associated with the dual processors configuration with separate memories.

5. Barber discloses a method comprising:

- .Transitioning a central processing unit (CPU) [high speed processor 42] of a computer system [40] into a low power mode [sleep] [col.4, ll.4-12], the computer system having a memory [50, RAM, DISK, fig.2] [col.3, ll.36-52].
- Activating a low power subsystem [44 with associated components] when the CPU enters the low power mode, the low-power subsystem including a low power processor [44] and an external interface [48] [col.4, ll.13-22].
- Independent of the CPU, using the low power processor of the low power subsystem to access data [contents of memory associated with process state] within the computer system memory [col.2, ll.13-19; col.3, ll.36-52; col.4, ll.13-22; 44 accesses data such as word processing from computer system memory while 42 is in sleep mode inactive].
- Providing the accessed data [e.g., word processing] through the external interface of the low-power subsystem [col.2, ll.13-19; word processing requires user interaction via well known monitor and keyboard conventionally through 48].

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Barber and Umina before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system taught by Umina to include the low power operations taught by Barber, as both are involved with dual processors [e.g., Barber's computer system memory 50 would be

analogous to Umina's 204]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to conserve power and integrate processors with different capabilities [Barber: col.2, ll.13-29].

7. As to claim 31, Barber discloses, wherein accessing data contained within the computer system memory comprises accessing data contained within a disk drive unit [DISK] [col.3, ll.40-45].

8. As to claim 32, Barber discloses, wherein the data contained in the shared database includes multimedia data [col.1, l.65 -- col.2, l.1; multimedia presentations operates with multimedia data which would still be in the shared memory system regardless of which processor is active].

9. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umina and Barber as applied to claims 29, 38 and 51 above, and further in view of Kableshkov, US Patent 6108663.

10. Umina and Barber taught each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claims 29, 38 and 51. Umina and Barber did not discuss the details of accessing data.

11. In re claim 30, Kabelshkov discloses a method wherein accessing data comprises accessing data through a shared database [relational database of 31] of a low power subsystem [30], the method further comprising storing at least a partial copy of data accessed from a computer system [10] memory [34] in the shared database [col.4, ll.36-61].

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kabelshkov, Umina and Barber before him at the time the invention was made, to

incorporate the teachings of Kabelshkov as the shared database taught by Kabelshkov is well known to be suitable for use in the system of Umina and Barber. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to access data [Kabelshkov: col.4, ll.50-56].

13. Claims 33-34, 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umina and Barber as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Ditzik, US Patent 5983073.

14. Umina and Barber disclose each and every limitation as discussed above. Barber did not disclose explicitly the presentation medium or the accessing of data from a network or a wireless interface.

15. In re claim 33, Ditzik discloses, comprising accessing data from a network [external wide area communications network] via the external interface of the [low-power] subsystem [14] [col.5, ll.52-59].

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik, Umina and Barber before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the low-power subsystem taught by Barber to include the teachings of Ditzik, as the network access and wireless interface taught by Ditzik is well known to be suitable for use in the system/subsystem of Umina and Barber. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides very well known ways to access/present data and extend the computer system's capabilities [Ditzik: col.2, l.33 -- col.3, l.22].

17. In re claim 34, Ditzik discloses, wherein accessing data from the network comprises accessing data from the network using a wireless interface [e.g., cdma] [col.5, ll.52-59; col.8, ll.4-58].

18. In re claim 36, Ditzik discloses, wherein providing the accessed data through the external interface comprises presenting the data accessed to a user via a display [fig.3c] of the external interface of the low power subsystem [col.13, ll.24-30; display graphics].

19. In re claim 37, Ditzik discloses, wherein providing the accessed data through the external interface comprises presenting the data accessed to a user via an audio medium [14a] of the [low-power] subsystem [14] [col.8, ll.4-58].

20. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, Umina and Barber as applied to claims 33 above, and further in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent 5590197, hereinafter Chen.

21. Ditzik, Umina and Barber disclose every limitation as discussed above in reference to claim 33. Ditzik, Umina and Barber did not disclose explicitly the network being an electronic store.

22. Chen discloses a network [fig.1] as an electronic store [merchant processor] allowing an electronic purchase [col.4, ll.46-50].

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Chen, Ditzik, Umina and Barber before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system as taught by Ditzik, Umina and Barber to include the network as taught by Chen, in order to obtain an electronic store allowing an electronic purchase. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as

it provides a way to extend the computer system's capabilities [Ditzik: col.2, l.33 -- col.3, l.22].

24. Claims 38-40, 42, 44, 48-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Hollon", US Patent 5768164, in view of Umina.

25. In re claim 38, Hollon discloses an apparatus [10] comprising:

- A computer system [i.e., associated with active mode] having a central processing unit [81], a system memory [82], and a user interface [e.g., 20], the computer system having a low power mode [inactive] [fig.1; col.3, l.2].
- A low-power subsystem [i.e., associated with inactive mode] in operation when the computer system enters the low power mode, the low power subsystem having a low power processor [84] and an external interface [e.g., 39] independent of the computer system, the low power processor providing access to the computer system when the computer system is in the low power mode and the external interface providing data accessed from the computer system externally [col.3, ll. 1-17].

26. Hollon did not disclose explicitly a mass storage device and a low power subsystem memory.

27. Umina discloses an apparatus [fig.2] comprising a computer system having a CPU [202] and a system memory [204]; a [low power] subsystem having a [low power] processor [206] and a [low power] subsystem memory [208].

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hollon and Umina before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system taught by Hollon to include the additional memories of a mass storage device and

a subsystem memory for the low power subsystem, as the use of mass storage devices and other memories for additional storage capacity is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to increase memory capacity and access flexibility [i.e., adding memory enables more information to be stored; separate subsystem memory for low power subsystem enables local storage for access flexibility].

29. As to claim 39, Umina discloses, a shared database [152] coupled to a computer system [102] and to a [low-power] subsystem [106] and wherein the [low power] processor [of 106] accesses the computer system through the shared database [fig.1b].

30. As to claim 40, Umina discloses, wherein the computer system memory comprises a random access memory [204 sram] coupled to the CPU. Umina did not disclose explicitly a computer system mass storage device that comprises a disk drive. However, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art would have coupled a disk drive unit to the CPU in order to increase memory capacity, as it is well known in the art that disk drives are mass storage devices that can increase memory capacity [i.e., adding memory enables more information to be stored].

31. As to claim 42, Hollon discloses, wherein data contained within the shared database includes multimedia data [fig.3-7].

32. As to claim 44, Hollon discloses, wherein the low power subsystem comprises a video display [39] to display data from a database [col.2, l.51 – col.3, l.5; col.3, ll.23-67].

33. As to claim 48, Hollon discloses, wherein the computer system [10] comprises a main screen [20] and the low-power subsystem comprises a miniature display screen [39]

and wherein low power subsystem including the miniature display screen is activated when the main screen is closed [col.2, l.51 – col.3, l.5].

34. As to claim 49, Hollon discloses, wherein the computer system comprises stored multimedia data, wherein the low-power subsystem accesses the stored multimedia data and wherein the low-power subsystem presents the multimedia data to a user through the external interface [fig.3-7].

35. As to claim 50, Hollon discloses, wherein the low-power subsystem presents the multimedia data to the user over a miniature display screen [39] of the external interface [col.2, l.51 – col.3, l.5].

36. In re claim 51, Hollon discloses a low-power subsystem [col.1, ll.21-29; col.3, ll.1-5; a subsystem with main system 10 and main display 20 inactive is relatively low-power] comprising:

- A miniature display screen [39].
- A user input unit [94 or 31-38].
- A low-power processor [84, 92 and associated components processes user inputs and displays outputs] coupled to the miniature display screen and the user input unit, the low power processor providing access for the miniature display screen and the user input unit to a connected computer system when the computer system is in a low power mode [inactive] [col.2, l.51 – col.3, l.5; col.3, ll.23-67; 82 contains applications shared when 10 is active or inactive].

37. Hollon did not disclose explicitly a low power subsystem memory.

38. Umina discloses an apparatus [fig.2] comprising a computer system having a CPU [202] and a system memory [204]; a [low power] subsystem having a [low power] processor [206] and a [low power] subsystem memory [208].

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hollon and Umina before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system taught by Hollon to include the additional memories of a subsystem memory for the low power subsystem. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to increase memory capacity and access flexibility [i.e., adding memory enables more information to be stored; separate subsystem memory for low power subsystem enables local storage for access flexibility].

40. As to claim 52, Umina discloses, wherein the processor provides access to the computer system through a shared database [152], the shared database being a part of the [low power] subsystem [106] [fig.1b].

41. Claims 41, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollon and Umina as applied to claims 40 above, and further in view of Kableshkov, US Patent 6108663.

42. Hollon and Umina taught each and every limitation as discussed above. Hollon and Umina did not discuss the details of accessing data.

43. In re claim 41, Kabelshkov discloses wherein the shared database is coupled to the disk drive unit [fig.2], the shared database to store at least a partial copy of data stored on the disk drive unit [col.4, ll.36-61].

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kabelshkov, Hollon and Umina before him at the time the invention was made, to

incorporate the teachings of Kabelshkov as the shared database taught by Kabelshkov is well known to be suitable for use in the system of Hollon and Umina. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to access data [Kabelshkov: col.4, ll.50-56].

45. As to claim 53, Kabelshkov discloses wherein the shared database is coupled to the computer system [fig.2] to store at least a partial copy of data stored in the computer system [col.4, ll.36-61].

46. Claims 43, 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollon and Umina applied to claims 38 and 51 above, and further in view of Ditzik, US Patent 5983073.

47. Hollon and Umina disclose every limitation as discussed above in reference to claim 38. Hollon and Umina did not disclose explicitly the presentation medium or the accessing of data from a network or a wireless interface.

48. In re claim 43, Ditzik discloses a low-power subsystem [14] that comprises a wireless interface [an interface in the broadest interpretation is needed to transmit/receive data] to connect with a local area network [col.8, ll.16-58; 100 and 14 constitutes a LAN].

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik, Hollon and Umina before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the low-power subsystem taught by Hollon and Umina to include the teachings of Ditzik, as the network access and wireless interface taught by Ditzik is well known to be suitable for use in the system/subsystem of Hollon and Umina. All of the components are known in the references. The only difference is integrating the subsystem component parts in a

wireless subsystem. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since the integration of the components would not change their respective functions in achieving the predictable result of

50. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides very well known ways to access/present data and extend the computer system's capabilities [Ditzik: col.2, l.33 -- col.3, l.22].

51. In re claim 45, Ditzik discloses a low-power subsystem [14] that comprises a wireless interface [51] to receive verbal instructions from a user interface [36 with associated components] [col.8, l.16 – col.9, l.19].

52. In re claim 46, Ditzik discloses, wherein the user interface comprises an audio headset [earset unit 34] to receive audio data transmitted from the wireless interface [51] [col.8, ll.4-58; 100 relays audio data to 34].

53. In re claim 47, Ditzik discloses, wherein the low-power subsystem [14] comprises an interface [e.g., CDMA] to transmit data to a cellular phone [fig.7; col.5, ll.52-59; col.12, ll.50-67; 14 transmits data to other cellular phones operating in CDMA].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tse Chen
August 20, 2007